

COMMENTS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on November 24, 2008. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 12 and 14-16 were pending. In response the Applicant has: 1) canceled no claims, and; 2) added no new claims; 3) amended claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14 and 15. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 12 and 14-16.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5, 8, 12 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Macintosh et al. US 2002/01385581 (hereinafter "Macintosh"); and in view of Friend, US 2004/0153512 (hereinafter "Friend") and further in view of and further in view of Gautier, US 2004/0045031 (hereinafter "Gautier"). Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Macintosh and Friend, in view of Hall, US 2004/0205173 (hereinafter "Hall").

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims render the claims allowable over the foregoing prior art. Specifically, none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features recited in the amended claims. For example, with respect to Claim 1, none of the references disclose or suggest "executing filtering logic to analyze the email message according to a specified set of filtering rules, wherein the filtering rules include comparing a source address or a subject field of the email message to that of known spammers; performing a checksum calculation on the incoming

email message and comparing the checksum to that of known spammers; and comparing the email address of the email message to a white list of known non-spam addresses.” With respect to email filtering, MacIntosh merely determines “whether the email forwarding address meets the auto-expiration criteria specified by the user,” which is quite different from the filtering techniques recited above.

In addition, none of the cited references disclose or suggest “a base text string corresponding to a text string from a non-disposable email address of a user and an extension text string corresponding to a text string from a Website address” nor do they disclose or suggest “inserting the extension text string into a subject field of the email message, the extension text string usable to identify the source of the email address.”

Independent Claims 8 and 15 include similar limitations. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 are in condition for allowance. The remaining claims are dependent claims which depend from Claims 1, 8, or 15 and include additional features. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Thomas C. Webster at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully Submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 1-26-09

/Thomas C. Webster/
Thomas C. Webster
Reg. No.: 46,154

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300